REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1-25 are under examination. Claims 2 and 6 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification and the claims as filed. In particular support can be found in the application as filed at page 3, lines 8-11, page 4, lines15-18, and page 4, line 22 through page 6, line 9.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 2-3 and 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as allegedly being indefinite because the phrase "further comprising a moiety covalently coupled to at least one...target organ" allegedly renders the claims unclear. (Office Action at Items 1-2) Claims 2 and 6 are amended herein. To the extent this rejection applies to the claims as amended, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Although clear as written, amended claim 2 and 6 now point out particular atoms where modifications to Formulas 1 and 2 are made. Additionally, the claims now specify that the moiety that is covalently linked to the compound provides the compound in a prodrug form. Finally, exemplary moieties to be attached to compounds of the present invention are well-described in the specification, for example, at page 4, line22 through page 6, line 9. Claim 3 and claim 7 depend from claims 2 and 6, respectively. The amendments to claims 2 and 6, accordingly, should render claim 3 and 7 definite. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 5, 9-18 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Bhat et al. U.S. 6,777,395 (hereinafter Bhat et al.). (Office action at Items 3-4) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have claimed priority to U.S. Provisional Application 60/350,296 (hereinafter the `296 application) filed January 17, 2002, one day prior to the filing date of Bhat et al. of January 18, 2002. Furthermore, the claims in the present application are fully supported throughout the `296 application which substantially overlaps to the present application. For example, claim 1 finds support in the `296 application as given by the structural formulas 1 and 2

7

shown at the top of page 3, and described on page 2, line 23 through page 3, line 4. With respect to claim 5, support can be found in the '296 application at page 5, lines 25-28. Claim 13 finds support in the '296 application on page 6, lines 3-14. As such, Bhat et al. does not qualify as prior art and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2-4, 6-8, and 19-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Bhat et al. (*supra*), in view of Erion et al. U.S. 7,205,404. This rejection is respectfully traversed. (Office Action at Items 5-8)

As discussed above, Bhat et al. does not qualify as prior art because the instant application claims priority to and has the necessary support for the instant claims in the '296 application. This renders the combination rejection herein moot. Erion on its own fails to teach or suggest the compounds recited in independent claims 1, 5, and 13. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

In light of the remarks herein, Applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request a notice to this effect. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent if there are any questions.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502624 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Victor Behar
Registration No. 60,691

4370 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 700
San Diego, CA 92122
Phone: 858.535.9001 VB:cjh:llf
Facsimile: 858.597.1585
Date: December 8, 2008

Please recognize our Customer No. 41552 as our correspondence address.

9